

10/539852

Chartered & European Patent Attorneys
Trade Mark Attorneys

JC05 Rec'd PCT/PTO 20 JUN 2005

Venner Shipley

International Preliminary Examining Authority
The Swedish Patent Office
Box 5055
SE-102 42 Stockholm
Sweden

Venner Shipley LLP
20 Little Britain
London EC1A 7DH

Telephone: +44 (0)20 7600 4212
Facsimile: +44 (0)20 7600 4188

Email: mail@vennershipley.co.uk
www.vennershipley.co.uk

3 November 2004

By facsimile and mail

Dear Sirs,

International (PCT) Patent Application No. IB03/05468
Method of Announcing Sessions
Nokia Corporation
Our ref: PJP/42084PCT1

In response to the written opinion dated 3 August 2004, we make the following observations:

The present application describes an Internet Protocol (IP) datacasting network which can be used to deliver IP services, such as on-line newspapers, radio, television, music, video, picture, games and software. IP services are organised into sessions, each session being transmitted on a given IP address, at a given time.

To enable users to discover and access a session, the network transmits a service guide in the form of a set of announcements that describe the sessions, for example by specifying the content, IP address and time of transmission.

Sessions can be updated. For instance, session content may be altered or a session transmission time may be changed. If users are to access sessions correctly, they must be notified of updated sessions. According to the present invention, there is provided a method of announcing sessions which comprises providing a first set of announcements describing a plurality of sessions and providing a second set of

Partners:

Alan Venner MITMA
Matthew Read BSc CPA EPA
Timothy Jump BSc CChem CPA EPA
Stuart Geary BSc CPA EPA
Stephen Killin BSc DPMI CChem CPA EPA
Jan Walaski BEng CPA EPA
Ian Grey BEng MSc CPA EPA
Siân Gill MA MSc CPA EPA

Associates:

Edmund Harrison BA MITMA
Pawel Piotrowicz BSc PhD CPA EPA
Catherine Cowley BSc PhD
Craig Thomson BSc MSc
Alexander Brown MEng
Diana Pizani BSc MSc PhD
Julia Mair MBBS EPA
Paul Derry BEng CPA EPA
Christine Caseman
Philip Harrison MEng
Erica Orton MChem

Philip Baker MPhil
Tanya Heare BSc DPMI
Almut Elend MA DPMI CPA EPA
Olivia Johansson MSc
Anna Reddish BA
Jonathan Jackson MEng(Hons) AMIE

Consultant:

John Woodward CPA EPA

3 November 2004

Page 2

announcements describing at least one updated session. This has the advantage that updated sessions can be announced quickly and efficiently. Thus, a user does not have to download an entire service guide before being notified of an updated session.

Claims 1, 32, 43, 51 53, 55, 57 and 58

We submit that claim 1 is new over D1.

D1 does not describe a method of announcing sessions transmitted through a network, the method comprising providing a first set of announcements describing a plurality of sessions and providing a second set of announcements describing at least one updated session.

This is because D1 describes neither announcements, nor sessions.

D1 merely describes a terminal notifying a centre apparatus of the version of the software currently being used by the terminal. The centre apparatus receives the notification and determines whether or not downloading of an updated version of the software is required (paragraph 0062).

However, the centre apparatus does not transmit or broadcast, let alone prepare, any sort of announcement describing a session, for example specifying the content, IP address and time of transmission of a session.

Furthermore, the sessions of claim 1 are announced and thus imply that the sessions are pre-arranged.

However, in D1, downloading is not pre-arranged. Instead, software is downloaded "on-demand". This arises because the system of D1 employs point-to-point transmission, rather than multicasting or broadcasting. Thus, the act of downloading is not a session according to claim 1.

D1 does not suggest announcing sessions or even using sessions and so we submit that claim 1 involves an inventive step over D1.

3 November 2004

Page 3.

We submit that claims 32, 43, 51 53, 55, 57 and 58 are new and involve an inventive step for reasons similar to those given in relation to claim 1.

Claims 62 to 65

We submit that claim 62 involves an inventive step over D1 and D2.

D1 does not disclose a system comprising at least two announcements, the schedule data being organized at least partly from a first set of announcements describing at least partly a plurality of sessions and at least partly from a second set of announcements describing at least one at least partly updated session.

Although D1 briefly mentions digital broadcast receivers (see paragraph 0002), the document concerns a program downloading system for rewriting software installed on an apparatus connected to a network via a digital transmission path (see paragraphs 0001 and 0031). In other words, the apparatus is generic and need not be a digital broadcast receiver. However, D2 specifically relates to apparatus for displaying program guide information (see column 1, lines 6 to 12 and column 4, lines 13 to 52).

Thus, one document relates to downloading software to a terminal, while the other document relates to displaying program guide information. Therefore, the skilled person would not consider combining the two documents.

Notwithstanding this, even if the skilled person did combine D1 and D2, then they would still not arrive at the invention claimed in claim 62.

This is because D2 does not disclose a second set of announcements describing at least one at least partly updated session.

D2 simply describes a display device which compares additional information newly received from a broadcasting station with previously received additional information to determine whether they are different from each other (see column 2, lines 39 to 46 and column 5, lines 10 to 20).

3 November 2004

Page 4

There is no disclosure of providing, for example full EPG information and separate, update EPG information.

We submit that claims 63, 64 and 65 involve an inventive step over D1 and D2 for similar reasons.

Claims 9-10, 13, 15, 17-25, 27-31, 33-42, 44-50, 52, 54, 56, 59-61 and 66-74

We submit that claims 9-10, 13, 15, 17-25, 27-31, 33-42, 44-50, 52, 54, 56, 59-61 and 66-74 are new and involve an inventive step by way of dependency.

We submit that the claimed invention is novel, involves an inventive step and is industrially applicable in accordance with Article 33(1) PCT. However, if the Examiner still considers that the international preliminary examination report should be negative in respect of any of the claims because the invention claimed therein does not appear to be novel, to involve an inventive step or to be industrially applicable, then we request that a second written opinion be drawn up.

Yours faithfully,

Pawel Piotrowicz
Authorised Representative

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

RECEIVED

- 6 SEP 2004

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:

VENNER SHIPLEY & CO
20 LITTLE BRITAIN
LONDON, EC1A 7DH
UNITED KINGDOM

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY
EXAMINING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 66)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

03 -08- 2004

Applicant's or agent's file reference

PJP/42084PCT1

REPLY DUE

within 60 days from
the above date of mailing

International application No.

PCT/IB2003/005468

International filing date (day/month/year)

27-11-2003

Priority date (day/month/year)

18-11-2002

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

H04N 5/445, G06F 17/30

Applicant

NOKIA CORPORATION ET AL

1. ☐ The written opinion established by the International Searching Authority:

☐ is
 ☐ is not

 considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This first (first, etc.) opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

☒ Box No. I . Basis of the opinion
☐ Box No. II Priority
☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application
3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(e).

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4bis. For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6. For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.
4. The final date by which the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter II of the PCT) must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 18-04-2005

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/SE

Patent- och registreringsverket
Box 5055
S-102 42 STOCKHOLM

Facsimile No. 46 8 667 72 88

Authorized officer

Anders Edlund /LR

Telephone No. 46 8 782 25 00

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/IB2003/005468

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ This opinion is based on a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of:

- ☐ international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b))
☐ publication of the international application (under Rule 12.4)
☐ international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3)

2. With regard to the elements of the international application, this opinion has been established on the basis of (*replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."*):

☒ the international application as originally filed/furnished

☐ the description:

pages _____ as originally filed/furnished

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

☐ the claims:

pages _____ as originally filed/furnished

pages _____ as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

☐ the drawings:

pages _____ as originally filed/furnished

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

☐ a sequence listing and/or any related table(s) – see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing.

3. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

☐ the description, pages _____

☐ the claims, Nos. _____

☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____

☐ the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

☐ any table(s) related to the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

4. ☐ This opinion has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

☐ the description, pages _____

☐ the claims, Nos. _____

☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____

☐ the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

☐ any table(s) related to the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IB2003/005468

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|--|
| Novelty (N) | Claims | <u>1, 32, 43, 51, 53, 55, 57-58</u> |
| | Claims | <u></u> |
| Inventive step (IS) | Claims | <u>9-10, 13, 15, 17-25, 27-31, 33-42</u> |
| | Claims | <u>44-50, 52, 54, 56, 59-74</u> |
| Industrial applicability (IA) | Claims | <u></u> |
| | Claims | <u></u> |

2. Citations and explanations:

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: EP 1246057 A2

D2: US 6209131 B1

Document D1 relates to a remote program downloading (i.e. EPG) system for remotely rewriting software installed into an apparatus connected to a network via a digital transmission path.

D2 describes an apparatus and a method for displaying program guide information in a display device, and more particularly to an apparatus and method for processing additional information in a display device, which are capable of when a scheduled program has been changed, automatically detecting such a situation and notifying a viewer of the change.

The object of the invention is to solve the problem which occurs when sessions transmitted through a network are updated.

Claim 1, 32, 43, 51, 53, 55, 57, 58:

From D1 a system is known (see abstract and paragraphs 8-37) , where program data is generated by configuring a plurality of modules based on a relationship between dependence of the modules composing the program. Then, generated two versions of program data is compared starting from a head address of each of the program data, and data at an address, and thereafter, where the data first makes a difference is extracted to generate difference data. Further, a center holds the latest version of program and at least one item of difference data, and transmits the whole data of program or difference data corresponding to a program version in a terminal apparatus,

.../...

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IB2003/005468

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of: BOX V

and the program is updated in the terminal apparatus using the received data.

The terminal can choose to update the data voluntarily (selectively) or the center can update the data in the terminal automatically (paragraph 62).

All technical features claimed in claims 1, 32, 43, 51, 53, 55, 57 and 58 of the invention are known from D1. Therefore, the invention according to claims 1, 32, 43, 51, 53, 55, 57 and 58 is not novel.

Claims 62, 63, 64 and 65:

The subject-matter of claim 62, 63, 64 and 65 differs from what is known in D1 (closest prior art) in that:

- In These claims are characteristics for presenting scheduled data on a display (with two announcements) described. However, In D1 it is mentioned (See paragraph 2) as prior art that the area of D1 could include displaying of an electronic program guide (program scheduling data).

The problem underlying the present application is consequently, that the display characteristic of D1 should be improved in order to include the combination of two different announcements.

The skilled person would consequently look in the areas where the problem of displaying scheduled data might arise. He would as a matter of fact consider to look in the technical field of electronic program guides.

In D2 it is known to display scheduled data by combining different announcements (see columns 2-3)

Without any extra inventive activity, the skilled person would transmit this solution, known from D2 into D1 in order to arrive at an object according to claims 62, 63, 64 and 65 of the invention. Therefore, claims 62, 63, 64 and 65 of the invention is not considered to include an inventive step.

Claims 9-10, 13, 15 , 17-25, 27-31, 33-42, 44-50, 52, 54, 56, 59-61 ,66-74:

In these claims, are other technical features stated for presenting scheduled data from two different announcements to

.../...

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IB2003/005468

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of: BOX V

a user. These claims differ from the invention claimed in previous claims (see above) in obvious details concerning presenting scheduled data. The inclusions of such features are regarded as part of customary praxis a skilled person would consider in accordance with circumstances. From that described in these claims, it is considered obvious for a person skilled in the art, with the knowledge of D1 and D2, to accomplish a method for presenting scheduled data as described in these claims. Therefore, the invention claimed in claims 9-10, 13, 15, 17-25, 27-31, 33-42, 44-50, 52, 54, 56, 59-61, 66-74 is not considered to involve an inventive step.